

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 21, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 21, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-12 stand objected to. The Examiner states that the term "large" is unclear. In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove the term "large" and clarify any possible ambiguity.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15-18, 21, 23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ruegenberg* (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0180703). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants submit that *Ruegenberg* does not qualify as a reference under §102(e). *Ruegenberg* is a 35 U.S.C. § 371 national stage filing of an international application that was published in German. Therefore, the only relevant date regarding the *Ruegenberg* U.S. application is the publication date of August 18, 2005, which is subsequent to the present application's filing date of 12 January 2004. For completeness, Applicants submit that the present application's effective filing date of 10 January 2003 is prior to the earliest corresponding publication (WO/03081308, published 2 October 2003) of the *Ruegenberg* U.S. application.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 10, 13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by *Ruegenberg* in view of *Chapman, et al* (U.S. Publication No.

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0553

2003/0223712). Claims 1, 4, 5, 13, 20, 21, 27, 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ruegenberg* in view of *Eskildsen, et al* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0108307). Claims 1, 8, 11, 13, 19, 21, 26, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ruegenberg* in view of *Huang, et al* (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0117856). Claims 1, 12-14, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ruegenberg* in view of *Walters, et al* (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0014198). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As stated above regarding the § 102 rejection, *Ruegenberg* does not qualify as a reference under §102(e) and is therefore not available as a reference in an obviousness rejection. All of the § 103 rejections rely on *Ruegenberg*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

Page 8

408932_1.DOC